

GIDEON KRACOV

Attorney at Law

801 South Grand Avenue
11th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90017

(213) 629-2071
Fax: (213) 623-7755

gk@gideonlaw.net
www.gideonlaw.net

May 22, 2014

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL, RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Praxair, Inc.
Steven F. Angel, CEO
c/o Corporation Service Company – Lawyers Incorporating Service
Agent for Service of Process
2710 Gateway Oaks Dr., Ste 150N
Sacramento, CA 95833

Praxair, Inc.
Roger Han, Facility Manager
5705 E. Airport Dr.
Ontario, CA 91761

Praxair, Inc.
Cindi Hughes, Enviro. Compliance Mgr
39 Old Ridgebury Rd
Danbury, CT 06810

Praxair, Inc.
Steven F. Angel, CEO
39 Old Ridgebury Rd
Danbury, CT 06810

**RE: Notice Of Violations And Intent To File Suit Under The Federal Water
Pollution Control Act Concerning Praxair Inc., 5705 E Airport Dr., Ontario,
California, WDID No. 8 36I001015**

Dear Mr. Angel, Mr. Han, and Ms. Hughes,

The Law Office of Gideon Kracov (hereinafter “**Office**”) on behalf of the Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice (hereinafter “**CCA EJ**”) is contacting you concerning Clean Water Act (hereinafter “**CWA**” or “**Act**”) violations at Praxair Inc.’s facility at 5705 E. Airport Dr. Ontario, California (hereinafter “**Facility**”). This letter is being sent to you,

Praxair Inc., Roger Han, Steven Angel and Cindi Hughes, as the responsible owners, officers, or operators of the Facility (collectively hereinafter “**Praxair**”).

CCA EJ is a non-profit public benefit corporation dedicated to working with communities to advocate for environmental justice and pollution prevention. CCA EJ has members living in the community adjacent to the Facility and the Santa Ana River Watershed. CCA EJ and its members are deeply concerned with protecting the environment in and around their communities, including the Santa Ana River Watershed.

This letter addresses Praxair unlawful discharge of pollutants from the Facility through the municipal storm sewer system into Etiwanda Creek and then into the Santa Ana River. The Facility is discharging storm water pursuant to National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (hereinafter “**NPDES**”) Permit No. CA S000001, California State Water Resources Control Board (hereinafter “**State Board**”) Order No. 92-12-DWQ as amended by Order No. 97-03-DWQ (hereinafter “**General Permit**”).¹ The WDID identification number for the Facility listed on documents submitted to the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region (“**Regional Board**”) is 8 36I001015. The Facility is engaged in ongoing violations of the substantive and procedural requirements of the General Permit.

Section 505(b) of the CWA requires a citizen to give notice of intent to file suit sixty (60) days prior to the initiation of a civil action under Section 505(a) of the Act (33 U.S.C. § 1365(a)). Notice must be given to the alleged violator, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (hereinafter “**EPA**”), and the State in which the violations occur.

As required by the Act, this Notice of Violation and Intent to File Suit provides notice of the violations that have occurred, and continue to occur, at the Facility. Consequently, Praxair is hereby placed on formal notice by CCA EJ that, after the expiration of sixty days from the date of this Notice of Violations and Intent to Sue, CCA EJ intends to file suit in federal court against Praxair under Section 505(a) of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. § 1365(a)), for violations of the CWA and General Permit. These violations are described more extensively below.

I. BACKGROUND.

Praxair filed a Notice of Intent to Comply With the Terms of the General Permit to Discharge Storm Water Associated with Industrial Activity (hereinafter “**NOI**”) and that NOI

¹ On April 1, 2014, the State Board reissued the General Permit, continuing its mandate that industrial facilities implement the best available technology economically achievable (“**BAT**”) and best conventional pollutant control technology (“**BCT**”) and, in addition, establishing numeric action levels mandating additional pollution control efforts. State Board Order 2014-0057-DWQ. The new permit, however, does not go into effect until July 1, 2015. Until that time, the current General Permit remains in full force and effect.

(undated) can be viewed on the State of California's State Water Resources Control Board website. The State Water Resources Control Board received the NOI on or before March 23, 1992. In its NOI, Praxair certified that the Facility is classified under SIC Code 2813 (Industrial Inorganic Chemicals). Praxair is an industrial gases company, supplying atmospheric, process, and specialty gases, as well as, high-performance coatings and related services. On information and belief, CCAEJ alleges that the Facility collects and discharges storm water from its industrial site into four or more storm drain outfalls located at the Facility. The outfalls discharge into the County's municipal storm sewer system, which flow into Etiwanda Creek which flow into the Santa Ana River.

The Regional Board has identified beneficial uses of the Santa Ana River Watershed and established water quality standards for the river and its tributaries in "The Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) for the Santa Ana River Basin" (hereinafter "**Basin Plan**"). See California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region, The Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) for the Santa Ana River Basin (2011), available at http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb8/water_issues/programs/basin_plan/index.shtml.

The beneficial uses of these waters include, among others, municipal and domestic supply, agricultural supply, groundwater recharge, water contact recreation, non-contact water recreation, warm freshwater habitat, cold freshwater habitat, and wildlife habitat. The non-contact water recreation use is defined as "[u]ses of water for recreational activities involving proximity to water, but not normally involving contact with water where water ingestion is reasonably possible." *Id.* at 3-3. These uses include, but are not limited to, picnicking, sunbathing, hiking, beachcombing, camping, boating, tidepool and marine life study, hunting, sightseeing, or aesthetic enjoyment in conjunction with the above activities." *Id.* Contact recreation use includes fishing and wading. *Id.* at 3-2. Visible pollution, including visible sheens and cloudy or muddy water from industrial areas, impairs people's use of the Santa Ana River for contact and non-contact water recreation.

The Basin Plan includes a narrative toxicity standard which states that "[t]oxic substances shall not be discharged at levels that will bioaccumulate in aquatic resources to levels which are harmful to human health." *Id.* at 4-18. The Basin Plan includes a narrative oil and grease standard which states that "[w]aste discharges shall not result in deposition of oil, grease, wax, or other material in concentrations which result in a visible film or in coating objects in the water, or which cause a nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses." *Id.* at 4-15. The Basin Plan includes a narrative suspended and settleable solids standard which states that "waters shall not contain suspended or settleable solids in amounts which cause a nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses" *Id.* at 4-16. The Basin Plan includes a narrative floatables standard which states that "[w]aste discharges shall not contain floating materials, including solids, liquids, foam or scum, which cause a nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses." *Id.* at 4-11. The Basin

Plan includes a narrative color standard which states that “[w]aste discharges shall not result in coloration of the receiving waters which causes a nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.” *Id.* at 4-10. The Basin Plan includes a narrative turbidity standard which states that “inland surface waters . . . shall be free of changes in turbidity which adversely affect beneficial uses. *Id.* at 4-18. The Basin Plan provides that “the pH of inland surface waters shall not be raised above 8.5 or depressed below 6.5...” *Id.* at 4-15. The Basin Plan also includes a Nitrate standard of 10 mg/L as Nitrogen. *Id.* at 4-14.

The Basin Plan also sets out additional numeric water quality standards for the Upper Santa Ana River, which the Facility’s discharge flows through. In particular, the Basin Plan sets a numeric water quality objective of 10 mg/L for total inorganic nitrogen. *Id.* at 4-35.

The EPA has published benchmark levels as guidelines for determining whether a facility discharging industrial storm water has implemented the requisite best available technology economically achievable (hereinafter “BAT”) and best conventional pollutant control technology (hereinafter “BCT”). The following benchmarks have been established for pollutants discharged by Praxair: Total Suspended Solids (TSS) – 100 mg/L, oil and grease – 15.0 mg/L (“O&G”), pH – 6-9 s.u., Iron (Fe) – 1.0 mg/L, nitrate + nitrite as nitrogen (“N+N”) – 0.68 mg/L, and Aluminum (Al) – 0.75 mg/L.² U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Multi-Sector General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Industrial Activity (2009) 52.

II. ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF THE NPDES PERMIT.

a. Discharges In Violation Of The Permit Not Subjected To BAT/BCT.

Praxair has violated and continues to violate the terms and conditions of the General Permit. Section 402(p) of the Act prohibits the discharge of storm water associated with industrial activities, except as permitted under an NPDES permit (33 U.S.C. § 1342) such as the General Permit. The General Permit prohibits any discharges of storm water associated with industrial activities or authorized non-storm water discharges that have not been subjected to BAT or BCT. Effluent Limitation B(3) of the General Permit requires dischargers to reduce or prevent pollutants in their storm water discharges through implementation of BAT for toxic and nonconventional pollutants and BCT for conventional pollutants. BAT and BCT include both nonstructural and structural measures. General Permit, Section A(8). Conventional pollutants are Total Suspended Solids, Oil and Grease, pH, Biochemical Oxygen Demand, and Fecal Coliform. 40 C.F.R. § 401.16. All other pollutants are either toxic or nonconventional. *Id.* §§ 401.15, 401.16.

In addition, Discharge Prohibition A(1) of the General Permit prohibits the discharge of materials other than storm water (defined as non-storm water discharges) that discharge either

² *Id.*

directly or indirectly to waters of the United States. Discharge Prohibition A(2) of the General Permit prohibits storm water discharges and authorized non-storm water discharges that cause or threaten to cause pollution, contamination, or nuisance.

Receiving Water Limitation C(1) of the General Permit prohibits storm water discharges and authorized non-storm water discharges to surface or groundwater that adversely impact human health or the environment. Receiving Water Limitation C(2) of the General Permit also prohibits storm water discharges and authorized non-storm water discharges that cause or contribute to an exceedance of any applicable water quality standards contained in a Statewide Water Quality Control Plan or the applicable Regional Board's Basin Plan. The General Permit does not authorize the application of any mixing zones for complying with Receiving Water Limitation C(2). As a result, compliance with this provision is measured at the Facility's discharge monitoring locations.

Praxair has discharged and continues to discharge storm water with unacceptable levels of TSS, pH, Iron, Aluminum, N+N and other pollutants in violation of the General Permit. Praxair's sampling and analysis results reported to the Regional Board confirm discharges of specific pollutants and materials other than storm water in violation of the Permit provisions listed above. Self-monitoring reports under the Permit are deemed "conclusive evidence of an exceedance of a permit limitation." *Sierra Club v. Union Oil*, 813 F.2d 1480, 1493 (9th Cir. 1988).

The following discharges of pollutants from the Facility contained concentrations of pollutants in excess of numeric water quality standards established in the Basin Plan, evidencing past and ongoing violations of General Permit Discharge Prohibitions A(1) and A(2), Effluent Limitation B(3) and Receiving Water Limitations C(1) and C(2).

Date	Parameter	Observed Concentration	Basin Plan or EPA Water Quality Standard	Outfall (as identified by the Facility)
12/13/2012	pH	9.5 s.u.	6.5-8.5 s.u.	ONT-D4
3/18/2012	pH	8.6 s.u.	6.5-8.5 s.u.	ONT-D2
10/5/2011	pH	6.3 s.u.	6.5-8.5 s.u.	ONT-D3

The information in the above table reflects data gathered from Praxair self-monitoring during the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 wet seasons. CCAEJ alleges that during each of these wet seasons and continuing through today, Praxair has discharged storm water contaminated with pollutants at levels or observations that exceed or violate the applicable water quality standard of 6.5 – 8.5 s.u. for pH in the Basin Plan.

The following discharges of pollutants from the Facility contained concentrations of pollutants in excess of numeric water quality benchmarks established by EPA in the MGSP (“**EPA Benchmarks**”), evidencing past and ongoing violations of General Permit Discharge Prohibitions A(1) and A(2), Effluent Limitation B(3) and Receiving Water Limitations C(1) and C(2).

Date	Parameter	Observed Concentration	EPA Benchmarks	Location (as identified by the Facility)
12/13/2012	pH	9.5 s.u.	6-9 s.u.	ONT-D4
2/19/2013	TSS	180 mg/L	100 mg/L	ONT-D1
2/19/2013	TSS	980 mg/L	100 mg/L	ONT-D2
2/19/2013	TSS	380 mg/L	100 mg/L	ONT-D3
12/13/2012	TSS	110 mg/L	100 mg/L	ONT-D3
12/13/2012	TSS	320 mg/L	100 mg/L	ONT-D4
10/14/2009	TSS	120 mg/L	100 mg/L	ONT D-2
2/19/2013	Iron	3.3 mg/L	1.0 mg/L	ONT-D1
2/19/2013	Iron	33 mg/L	1.0 mg/L	ONT-D2
2/19/2013	Iron	10 mg/L	1.0 mg/L	ONT-D3
2/19/2013	Iron	1.6 mg/L	1.0 mg/L	ONT-D4
12/13/2012	Iron	1.4 mg/L	1.0 mg/L	ONT-D1
12/13/2012	Iron	10 mg/L	1.0 mg/L	ONT-D2
12/13/2012	Iron	8.8 mg/L	1.0 mg/L	ONT-D3
12/13/2012	Iron	9.6 mg/L	1.0 mg/L	ONT-D4
3/18/2012	Iron	1.4 mg/L	1.0 mg/L	ONT-D1
3/18/2012	Iron	1.2 mg/L	1.0 mg/L	ONT-D2
3/18/2012	Iron	2.4 mg/L	1.0 mg/L	ONT-D4
10/5/2011	Iron	2.6 mg/L ³	1.0 mg/L	ONT-D1
10/5/2011	Iron	3.4 mg/L	1.0 mg/L	ONT-D2

³ A June 27, 2013 letter from Praxair to the Regional Board indicates that these 2011-2012 wet year metals results were initially misreported as mg/L instead of ug/L.

Praxair Inc.– Clean Water Act Notice of Violations & Intent to File Suit

May 22, 2014

Page 7 of 14

10/5/2011	Iron	1.4 mg/L	1.0 mg/L	ONT-D3
12/5/2010	Iron	1.9 mg/L	1.0 mg/L	ONT-D1
12/5/2010	Iron	5.8 mg/L	1.0 mg/L	ONT-D2
12/5/2010	Iron	1.5 mg/L	1.0 mg/L	ONT-D3
12/5/2010	Iron	1.2 mg/L	1.0 mg/L	ONT-D4
10/14/2009	Iron	3300 mg/L	1.0 mg/L	ONT D-1
10/14/2009	Iron	3700 mg/L	1.0 mg/L	ONT D-2
10/14/2009	Iron	2200 mg/L	1.0 mg/L	ONT D-3
10/14/2009	Iron	540 mg/L	1.0 mg/L	ONT D-4
12/7/2009	Iron	1700 mg/L	1.0 mg/L	ONT D-1
12/7/2009	Iron	2100 mg/L	1.0 mg/L	ONT D-2
12/7/2009	Iron	1400 mg/L	1.0 mg/L	ONT D-3
12/7/2009	Iron	1800 mg/L	1.0 mg/L	ONT D-4
10/14/2009	Aluminum	2900 mg/L	.75 mg/L	ONT D-1
10/14/2009	Aluminum	3500 mg/L	.75 mg/L	ONT D-2
10/14/2009	Aluminum	1900 mg/L	.75 mg/L	ONT D-3
10/14/2009	Aluminum	4400 mg/L	.75 mg/L	ONT D-3
12/7/2009	Aluminum	1400 mg/L	.75 mg/L	ONT D-1
12/7/2009	Aluminum	1900 mg/L	.75 mg/L	ONT D-2
12/7/2009	Aluminum	1100 mg/L	.75 mg/L	ONT D-3
12/7/2009	Aluminum	1500 mg/L	.75 mg/L	ONT D-4
2/19/2013	Aluminum	2.5 mg/L	0.75 mg/L	ONT-D1
2/19/2013	Aluminum	21 mg/L	0.75 mg/L	ONT-D2
2/19/2013	Aluminum	7.3 mg/L	0.75 mg/L	ONT-D3
2/19/2013	Aluminum	1.1 mg/L	0.75 mg/L	ONT-D4
12/13/2012	Aluminum	1.2 mg/L	0.75 mg/L	ONT-D1
12/13/2012	Aluminum	9.9 mg/L	0.75 mg/L	ONT-D2
12/13/2012	Aluminum	7.5 mg/L	0.75 mg/L	ONT-D3
12/13/2012	Aluminum	11 mg/L	0.75 mg/L	ONT-D4
3/18/2012	Aluminum	1.1 mg/L	0.75 mg/L	ONT-D1
3/18/2012	Aluminum	1.1 mg/L	0.75 mg/L	ONT-D2
3/18/2012	Aluminum	1.6 mg/L	0.75 mg/L	ONT-D3
3/18/2012	Aluminum	1.6 mg/L	0.75 mg/L	ONT-D4
10/5/2011	Aluminum	2.1 mg/L	0.75 mg/L	ONT-D1
10/5/2011	Aluminum	2.9 mg/L	0.75 mg/L	ONT-D2
10/5/2011	Aluminum	1.1 mg/L	0.75 mg/L	ONT-D3
12/19/2010	Aluminum	0.80 mg/L	0.75 mg/L	ONT-D2
12/5/2010	Aluminum	0.88 mg/L	0.75 mg/L	ONT-D1

12/5/2010	Aluminum	4.3 mg/L	0.75 mg/L	ONT-D2
12/5/2010	Aluminum	1.2 mg/L	0.75 mg/L	ONT-D3
12/5/2010	Aluminum	0.98 mg/L	0.75 mg/L	ONT-D4
2/19/2013	N+N	4.3 mg/L	0.68 mg/L	ONT-D2
2/19/2013	N+N	1.4 mg/L	0.68 mg/L	ONT-D4
12/13/2012	N+N	1.52 mg/L	0.68 mg/L	ONT-D1
12/13/2012	N+N	1.65 mg/L	0.68 mg/L	ONT-D2
3/18/2012	N+N	1.9 mg/L	0.68 mg/L	ONT-D1
3/18/2012	N+N	5.1 mg/L	0.68 mg/L	ONT-D2
3/18/2012	N+N	7.3 mg/L	0.68 mg/L	ONT-D3
3/18/2012	N+N	8.2 mg/L	0.68 mg/L	ONT-D4
10/5/2011	N+N	1.43 mg/L	0.68 mg/L	ONT-D1
10/5/2011	N+N	1.24 mg/L	0.68 mg/L	ONT-D2
10/5/2011	N+N	1.8 mg/L	0.68 mg/L	ONT-D3
10/5/2011	N+N	0.95 mg/L	0.68 mg/L	ONT-D4
12/19/2010	N+N	0.77 mg/L	0.68 mg/L	ONT-D4
12/5/2010	N+N	1.41 mg/L	0.68 mg/L	ONT-D1
12/5/2010	N+N	1.74 mg/L	0.68 mg/L	ONT-D2
12/5/2010	N+N	1.1 mg/L	0.68 mg/L	ONT-D3
12/5/2010	N+N	1 mg/L	0.68 mg/L	ONT-D4
10/14/2009	N+N	1.4 mg/L	0.68 mg/L	ONT-D1
10/14/2009	N+N	3.7 mg/L	0.68 mg/L	ONT-D2
10/14/2009	N+N	2 mg/L	0.68 mg/L	ONT-D3
10/14/2009	N+N	2.6 mg/L	0.68 mg/L	ONT-D4
12/7/2009	N+N	1.6 mg/L	0.68 mg/L	ONT-D2
12/7/2009	N+N	1.9 mg/L	0.68 mg/L	ONT-D3
12/7/2009	N+N	.81 mg/L	0.68 mg/L	ONT-D4

The information in the above table reflects data gathered from Praxair self-monitoring during the 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 wet seasons. CCAEJ alleges that during each of those rainy seasons and continuing through today, Praxair has discharged storm water contaminated with pollutants that exceed one or more applicable EPA Benchmarks, including, but not limited to, each of the following:

- Total Suspended Solids – 100 mg/L;
- pH – 6-9 s.u.;
- Iron – 1.0 mg/L;

- Aluminum – 0.75 mg/L; and
- N+N – 0.68 mg/L.

CCA EJ's investigation, including its review of Praxair analytical results documenting pollutant levels in the Facility's storm water discharges well in excess of applicable water quality standards and the EPA's benchmark values, indicate that Praxair has not implemented BAT and BCT at the facility for its discharges of TSS, pH, Iron, N+N, Aluminum and other pollutants in violation of Effluent Limitation B(3) of the General Permit. Praxair was required to have implemented BAT and BCT by no later than October 1, 1992, or since the date the Facility opened. Thus, Praxair is discharging polluted storm water associated with its industrial operations without having implemented BAT and BCT.

In addition, the numbers listed in the table above indicate that the Facility is discharging polluted storm water in violation of Discharge Prohibitions A(1) and A(2) and Receiving Water Limitations C(1) and C(2) of the General Permit. CCA EJ alleges that such violations also have occurred and will occur on other rain dates, including every significant rain event that has occurred since at least May 22, 2009 and that will occur at the Facility subsequent to the date of this Notice of Violation and Intent to File Suit. Attachment A, attached hereto, sets forth each of the specific rain dates on which CCA EJ alleges that Praxair has discharged storm water containing impermissible levels of TSS, pH, Iron, N+N, Aluminum and other pollutants in violation of Effluent Limitation B(3), Discharge Prohibitions A(1) and A(2) and Receiving Water Limitations C(1) and C(2) of the General Permit.⁴

These unlawful discharges from the Facility are ongoing. Each discharge of storm water containing any of these pollutants constitutes a separate violation of the General Permit and the Act. Consistent with the five-year statute of limitations applicable to citizen enforcement actions brought pursuant to the CWA, Praxair is subject to penalties for violations of the General Permit and the Act since May 22, 2009.

b. Failure To Develop And Implement An Adequate Monitoring And Reporting Program.

Section B of the General Permit describes the monitoring requirements for storm water and non-storm water discharges. Facilities are required to make monthly visual observations of storm water discharges (Section B(4)) and quarterly visual observations of both unauthorized and authorized non-storm water discharges (Section B(3)). Section B(5) requires facility operators to sample and analyze at least two storm water discharges from all storm water discharge locations

⁴ The rain dates are all the days when an average of 0.1 or more rain fell as measured by a weather station located in Ontario approximately 10 miles away.

during each wet season. Section B(7) requires that the visual observations and samples must represent the “quality and quantity of the facility’s storm water discharges from the storm event.”

The above-referenced data was obtained from the Facility’s monitoring program as reported in its Annual Reports submitted to the Regional Board. This data is evidence that the Facility has violated various Discharge Prohibitions, Receiving Water Limitations, and Effluent Limitations in the General Permit. To the extent the storm water data collected by Praxair is not representative of the quality of the Facility’s various storm water discharges and that the Facility failed to monitor all qualifying storm water discharges, CCAEJ alleges that the Facility’s monitoring program violates Sections B(3), (4), (5) and (7) of the General Permit.

CCAIEJ also alleges that Praxair failed to sample discharges from all three outfalls during 2010-2011, failing to sample outfalls D1, D2 and D3.

CCAIEJ also alleges on information and belief that Praxair failed to conduct visual observations in January 2010, March 2010, January 2011, February 2011 and January to March 2013, claiming that there were no qualifying rain events. On information and belief, CCAIEJ alleges that there were numerous qualifying rain events that would have resulted in discharges during these periods.

The above violations are ongoing. Consistent with the five-year statute of limitations applicable to citizen enforcement actions brought pursuant to the federal Clean Water Act, Praxair is subject to penalties for violations of the General Permit and the Act’s monitoring and sampling requirements since May 22, 2009.

c. Failure To Analyze For Mandatory Parameters.

With some limited adjustments, facilities covered by the General Permit must sample two storm events per season from each of their storm water discharge locations. General Permit, Section B(5)(a). Collected samples must be analyzed for Total Suspended Solids, pH, Specific Conductance and either Total Organic Carbon or O&G. *Id.* at Section B(5)(c)(i). Facilities must also analyze their storm water samples for “[t]oxic chemicals and other pollutants that are likely to be present in storm water discharges in significant quantities,” including copper, lead, zinc, aluminum, chemical oxygen demand, and iron. *Id.* at Section B(5)(c)(ii). Additionally, because Praxair filed its NOI under SIC Code 2813, it must sample for the additional pollutants of Iron, Aluminum, and N+N. *See* General Permit, Table D.

CCAIEJ’s investigation of Praxair’s monitoring data indicates that Praxair failed to analyze for N+N during the 2009-2010 wet season.

Each failure to analyze for mandatory parameters constitutes a separate violation of the General Permit and the Act. Consistent with the five-year statute of limitations applicable to

citizen enforcement actions brought pursuant to the CWA, Praxair is subject to penalties for violations of the General Permit and the Act since May 22, 2009.

d. Failure To Prepare, Implement, Review and Update An Adequate Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan.

Section A and Provision E(2) of the General Industrial Storm Water Permit require dischargers of storm water associated with industrial activity to develop, implement, and update an adequate storm water pollution prevention plan (hereinafter “SWPPP”) no later than October 1, 1992. Section A(1) and Provision E(2) requires dischargers who submitted an NOI pursuant to the General Permit to continue following their existing SWPPP and implement any necessary revisions to their SWPPP in a timely manner, but in any case, no later than August 1, 1997.

The SWPPP must, among other requirements, identify and evaluate sources of pollutants associated with industrial activities that may affect the quality of storm and non-storm water discharges from the facility and identify and implement site-specific best management practices (hereinafter “BMPs”) to reduce or prevent pollutants associated with industrial activities in storm water and authorized non-storm water discharges (General Permit, Section A(2)). The SWPPP must include BMPs that achieve BAT and BCT (Effluent Limitation B(3)). The SWPPP must include: a description of individuals and their responsibilities for developing and implementing the SWPPP (General Permit, Section A(3)); a site map showing the facility boundaries, storm water drainage areas with flow pattern and nearby water bodies, the location of the storm water collection, conveyance and discharge system, structural control measures, impervious areas, areas of actual and potential pollutant contact, and areas of industrial activity (General Permit, Section A(4)); a list of significant materials handled and stored at the site (General Permit, Section A(5)); a description of potential pollutant sources including industrial processes, material handling and storage areas, dust and particulate generating activities, a description of significant spills and leaks, a list of all non-storm water discharges and their sources, and a description of locations where soil erosion may occur (General Permit, Section A(6)).

The SWPPP also must include an assessment of potential pollutant sources at the Facility and a description of the BMPs to be implemented at the Facility that will reduce or prevent pollutants in storm water discharges and authorized non-storm water discharges, including structural BMPs where non-structural BMPs are not effective (General Permit, Section A(7), (8)). The SWPPP must be evaluated to ensure effectiveness and must be revised where necessary (General Permit, Section A(9),(10)). The SWPPP must also include a certification statement and signature (General Permit, Section C(10)).

CCA EJ’s investigation of the conditions at the Facility as well as Praxair Annual Reports indicate that Praxair has been operating with an inadequately developed SWPPP in violation of

the requirements set forth above. Praxair has failed to evaluate the effectiveness of its BMPs and to revise its SWPPP as necessary. Praxair has been in continuous violation of Section A and Provision E(2) of the General Permit every day since May 22, 2009, at the very latest, and will continue to be in violation every day that Praxair fails to prepare, implement, review, and update an effective SWPPP. Praxair is subject to penalties for violations of the Order and the Act occurring since May 22, 2009.

e. Failure To File True And Correct Annual Reports.

Section B(14) of the General Industrial Storm Water Permit requires dischargers to submit an Annual Report by July 1st of each year to the executive officer of the relevant Regional Board. The Annual Report must be signed and certified by an appropriate corporate officer. General Permit, Sections B(14), C(9), C(10). Section A(9)(d) of the General Industrial Storm Water Permit requires the discharger to include in their annual report an evaluation of their storm water controls, including certifying compliance with the General Industrial Storm Water Permit. *See also* General Permit, Sections C(9) and (10) and B(14).

During the 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 wet seasons, Praxair Inc. inaccurately certified in the Annual Report that the facility was in compliance with the General Permit. Consequently, Praxair has violated Sections A(9)(d), B(14), C(9) and C(10) of the General Industrial Storm Water Permit every time Praxair failed to submit a complete or correct report and every time Praxair or its agents failed to comply with the Act. Praxair is subject to penalties for violations of Section (C) of the General Industrial Storm Water Permit and the Act occurring since May 22, 2009.

III. Persons Responsible For the Violations.

CCA EJ puts Praxair Inc., Roger Han, Steven Angel and Cindi Hughes on notice that they are the persons responsible for the violations described above. If additional persons are subsequently identified as also being responsible for the violations set forth above, CCA EJ puts Praxair Inc., Roger Han, and Cindi Hughes on notice that it intends to include those persons in this action.

IV. Name And Address Of Noticing Parties.

The name, address and telephone number of CCA EJ is as follows:

Penny Newman
Executive Director
Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice
P.O. Box 33124

Jurupa Valley, CA 92519
Tel. (951) 360-8451

V. Counsel.

CCA EJ has retained counsel to represent it in this matter. Please direct all communications to:

Gideon Kracov
The Law Office of Gideon Kracov
801 South Grand Avenue
11th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90017
Tel: (213) 629-2071
E-Mail: gk@gideonlaw.net

Michael R. Lozeau
Douglas J. Chermak
Lozeau Drury LLP
410 12th Street
Suite 250
Oakland, California 94607
Tel: (510) 836-4200
E-Mail: michael@lozeaudrury.com
E-Mail: doug@lozeaudrury.com

VI. Penalties.

Pursuant to Section 309(d) of the Act (33 U.S.C. § 1319(d)) and the Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties for Inflation (40 C.F.R. § 19.4) each separate violation of the Act subjects Praxair to a penalty of up to \$37,500 per day per violation. In addition to civil penalties, CCA EJ will seek injunctive relief preventing further violations of the Act pursuant to Sections 505(a) and (d) (33 U.S.C. § 1365(a) and (d)) and such other relief as permitted by law. Lastly, Section 505(d) of the Act (33 U.S.C. § 1365(d)), permits prevailing parties to recover costs and fees, including attorneys' fees.

CCA EJ believes this Notice of Violations and Intent to File Suit sufficiently states grounds for filing suit. CCA EJ intends to file a citizen suit under Section 505(a) of the Act against Praxair and its agents for the above-referenced violations upon the expiration of the 60-day notice period. However, during the 60-day notice period, CCA EJ would be willing to discuss effective remedies for the violations noted in this letter. If you wish to pursue such discussions in the absence of litigation, CCA EJ suggests that you initiate those discussions within the next 20 days so that they may be completed before the end of the 60-day notice period. CCA EJ does not intend to delay the filing of a complaint in federal court if discussions are

///

continuing when that period ends.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'G. Kracov', written over a horizontal line.

Gideon Kracov

The Law Office of Gideon Kracov
Attorneys for Center for Community Action and
Environmental Justice

SERVICE LIST

Gina McCarthy, Administrator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
12000 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460

Thomas Howard, Executive Director
State Water Resources Control Board
P.O. Box 100
Sacramento, CA 95812-0100

Eric Holder, U.S. Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Citizen Suit Coordinator
Environment and Natural Resources Division
Law and Policy Section
P.O. Box 7415
Ben Franklin Station
Washington, DC 20044-7415

Jared Blumenfeld, Regional Administrator
U.S. EPA – Region 9
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

Kurt V. Berchtold, Executive Officer
Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board
3737 Main Street
Suite 500
Riverside, CA 92501-3348

*Served via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested.

ATTACHMENT A
Rain Dates, Praxair, Ontario, California

11/30/2009	12/6/2009	12/7/2009
12/16/2009	12/29/2009	1/3/2010
1/4/2010	1/5/2010	1/7/2010
1/9/2010	1/10/2010	2/7/2010
2/8/2010	2/12/2010	2/14/2010
2/17/2010	2/19/2010	2/20/2010
2/21/2010	2/22/2010	2/23/2010
2/25/2010	2/27/2010	2/28/2010
3/1/2010	3/2/2010	3/5/2010
3/15/2010	3/17/2010	11/30/2010
12/6/2010	12/7/2010	12/16/2010
1/3/2011	1/4/2011	1/5/2011
1/7/2011	1/9/2011	1/10/2011
2/7/2011	2/8/2011	2/12/2011
2/14/2011	2/17/2011	2/19/2011
2/20/2011	2/21/2011	2/22/2011
2/23/2011	2/25/2011	2/27/2011
2/28/2011	3/1/2011	3/2/2011
3/5/2011	3/15/2011	3/17/2011
11/30/2011	12/6/2011	12/7/2011
12/16/2011	12/29/2011	1/3/2012
1/4/2012	1/5/2012	1/7/2012
1/9/2012	1/10/2012	2/7/2012

2/8/2012	2/12/2012	2/14/2012
2/17/2012	2/19/2012	2/20/2012
2/21/2012	2/22/2012	2/23/2012
2/25/2012	2/27/2012	2/28/2012
2/29/2012	3/1/2012	3/2/2012
3/5/2012	3/15/2012	3/17/2012
11/30/2012	12/6/2012	12/7/2012
12/16/2012	12/29/2012	1/3/2013
1/4/2013	1/5/2013	1/7/2013
1/9/2013	1/10/2013	2/7/2013
2/8/2013	2/12/2013	2/14/2013
2/17/2013	2/19/2013	2/20/2013
2/21/2013	2/22/2013	2/23/2013
2/25/2013	2/27/2013	2/28/2013
3/1/2013	3/2/2013	3/5/2013
3/15/2013	3/17/2013	11/30/2013
12/6/2103	12/7/2013	12/16/2013
1/3/2014	1/4/2014	1/5/2014
1/7/2014	1/9/2014	1/10/2014
2/7/2014	2/8/2014	2/12/2014
2/12/2014	2/17/2014	2/19/2014
2/20/2014	2/21/2014	2/22/2014
2/23/2014	2/25/2014	2/27/2014
2/28/2014	3/1/2014	3/2/2014
3/5/2014		